

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly not being supported by the originally filed disclosure.

Claims 1, 4, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,219,126 to *Von Gutfeld*.

Claims 5 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Von Gutfeld* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,263,888 to *Ishihara et al.* (hereinafter “*Ishihara*”).

Response Should be Entered

Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claims 8-9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 11-12 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-5, and 10-12 are presently pending.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 1 and 5 do not raise new issues requiring further search and/or further consideration because the newly added features were previously recited in claims 8-9. Moreover, the addition of new claims 11-12 do not raise new issues requiring further consideration and/or search because the features of these claims were previously recited in claims 1 and 5 as well as claims 8-9. Further, in adding new claims 11-12, Applicant have canceled a corresponding number of claims. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the present amendments should be entered.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly not being supported by the originally filed disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 1 and 5 make the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, moot.

All Claims are Allowable

Claims 1, 4, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,219,126 to *Von Gutfeld*. Claims 5 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Von Gutfeld* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,263,888 to *Ishihara et al.* (hereinafter “*Ishihara*”). Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 5, as amended, Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Von Gutfeld* nor *Ishihara et al.*, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest a protrusion formed of ITO. With respect to independent claims 11-12, as added, Applicant respectfully submit that neither *Von Gutfeld* nor *Ishihara et al.*, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest a protrusion formed of metal. Applicant respectfully submits that the use of ITO and metal are particularly advantageous. Specifically, production can be made more efficient if the protrusion can be formed by the same processes and at the same time as the LCD cell structures on the plate.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 5, and 11-12 are allowable over the applied art. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims are allowable at least because of their respective dependence from independent claims 1 and 5, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040

Date: November 12, 2004

Customer No. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel.: (202) 739-3000